

REMARKS

Claims 1-7, 9-20 and 22-28 are pending in the application. In the Office Action of October 5, 2004, the Examiner made the following disposition:

- A.) Objected to Figure 1.
- B.) Rejected claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-15, 17-20, and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by *Dulude et al.* in view of *Tamada et al.*
- C.) Rejected claims 3 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude et al.* as modified by *Tamada et al.* and further in view of *Epstein*.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and addresses the Examiner's disposition as follows:

- A.) Objection to Figure 1:

Figure 1 has been amended as per the Examiner's request to overcome the objection.

Applicant respectfully submits the objection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

- B.) Rejection of claims 1, 2, 4-7, 9-15, 17-20, and 22-28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being anticipated by *Dulude et al.* in view of *Tamada et al.*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Applicant's independent claims 1, 14, and 25-28 each claim a person authentication authority that receives a request for updating an issued electronic person authentication certificate from an entity that received the electronic person authentication certificate, makes a second electronic person authentication certificate in which an updated certificate expiration date or an updated certificate usage number limit is set according to the request, and then issues the second electronic person authentication certificate.

This is clearly unlike *Dulude* in view of *Tamada*, which fails to disclose or suggest making and issuing a second certificate responsive to the request. As acknowledged by the Examiner, *Dulude* fails to disclose making and issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate expiration date or updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from an entity that received a certificate. Applicant respectfully submits that *Dulude* in view of *Tamada* still fails to disclose or suggest at least that claimed subject matter.

Tamada teaches an IC card having an update function in which a user can request an update of the transaction amount and valid date of the IC card. Thus, the IC card itself is updated

with a new transaction amount and valid date in response to the user's request. Accordingly, unlike Applicant's claimed invention, *Tamada* does not make and issue a second certificate, but instead merely updates an existing IC card. Therefore, *Dulude* in view of *Tamada* still fails to disclose or suggest claims 1, 14, and 25-28.

Claims 2, 4-7, 9-13, 15, 17-20, and 22-24 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 14 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

C.) Rejection of claims 3 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Dulude et al.* as modified by *Tamada et al.* and further in view of *Epstein*:

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection.

Claims 1 and 14 are allowable over *Dulude* in view of *Tamda* as discussed above. *Epstein* still fails to disclose or suggest making and issuing a second certificate as claimed by Applicant. *Epstein* discloses a ticket that identifies a usage limit associated with each copy of a copy-protected material. If there are multiple copies of the same material, then a provider of the copies maintains a total-usage-measure for all the copies that have been "checked out" by patrons. When a checked-out copy is returned, then the total-usage measure indicates that another copy is available for check-out.

Thus, unlike Applicant's independent claims, *Epstein* does not teach making and issuing a second certificate having an updated certificate usage number responsive to a request from a recipient of a certificate. Instead, *Epstein* merely issues a ticket that is good for a number of uses, and does not issue a second ticket. In fact, *Epstein* fails to even discuss issuing a second ticket responsive to a request.

Therefore, *Dulude* in view of *Tamada* and further in view of *Epstein* fails to disclose or even suggest claims 1 and 14.

Claims 3 and 16 depend directly or indirectly from claims 1 or 14 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons that claims 1 and 14 are allowable.

Applicant respectfully submits the rejection has been overcome and requests that it be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-7, 9-20 and 22-28 are patentable. It is therefore submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

 (Reg. No. 45,034)
Christopher P. Rauch
SONNENSCHEIN, NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box #061080
Wacker Drive Station - Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Telephone 312/876-2606
Customer #26263
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

IN THE DRAWINGS

Please replace Figure 1 with the replacement drawing sheet for Figure 1 submitted herewith.